

Attorney Docket Number: FSP0357
Application Number: 10/578,872

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
OCT 21 2010

-1-

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

AMENDMENT AND REMARKS

FOR

Attorney Docket Number: FSP0357
Client Reference Number: 287846US
Title: System to provide markers to affect rendering and navigation of content on demand
Application Number: 10/578,872
Filing Date: Wednesday, February 28, 2007

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via EFS or facsimile to the USPTO (number 571-273-8300) or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on:

10/21/10
Date

/Charles A. Mirho/
~~NAME~~ Charles A. Mirho

Attorney Docket Number: FSP0357
Application Number: 10/578,872

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
OCT 21 2010

-2-

Summary of Office Action

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over US Patent 5,721,829 to Dunn et al (hereafter referenced as Dunn) in view of US PG Pub 2009/0144781 to Glaser et al (hereafter referenced as Glaser). Claims 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over US Patent 7,055,166 to Logan et al (hereafter referenced as Logan) in view of Glaser. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Dunn in view of Glaser as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US Patent 6,115,057 to Kwoh et al (hereafter referenced as Kwoh). Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Logan in view of Glaser as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Kwoh. Claims 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Logan in view of Glaser as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of US PG Pub 2003/0188316 to DePrez (hereafter referenced as DePrez). Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Logan in view of Glaser and DePrez as applied to claim 11-15 above, and further in view of Kwoh.